Page 1703 – 1714 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1111667*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 9 | Issue 2

2026

© 2026 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

Alternate Dispute Resolution in Mergers and Amalgamations

SHREYA[1] AND SUJATA BISWAS[2]

ABSTRACT

Disputes in mergers and acquisitions are less an exception and more a structural feature of complex corporate transactions. From valuation disagreements and warranty breaches to regulatory hurdles and post-closing friction, the scope for conflict is built into the process itself. This paper examines how Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) can be positioned not merely as a fallback, but as an integral part of transaction design in mergers and amalgamations.

Focusing on the Indian context, the paper traces the use of ADR mechanisms such as mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and allied processes across different stages of an M&A deal. It looks at how pre-negotiation mediation and confidentiality arrangements can stabilise early discussions, how dispute resolution clauses in due diligence and transaction documents pre-empt escalation, and how arbitration and specialised mechanisms such as expert determination or dispute boards become relevant during post-closing integration.

The discussion also engages with practical limits, particularly where questions of arbitrability and regulatory oversight restrict the use of private dispute resolution. Rather than treating ADR as uniformly applicable, the paper emphasises the need for calibrated use, depending on the nature of the dispute and the stage of the transaction.

Through this stage-wise analysis, the paper argues that the real value of ADR in M&A lies in anticipation rather than cure. When embedded thoughtfully through ancillary agreements and tailored clauses, ADR can reduce transaction risk, contain delays, and preserve working relationships without compromising legal certainty.

Keywords: *Mergers and Acquisitions (M&A), Corporate Restructuring, Post-Merger Integration, Due Diligence Disputes.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The landscape of modern business is characterised by dynamic, intricate corporate transactions, chief among them mergers and acquisitions (M&A). These transactions, driven by strategic imperatives such as market consolidation, diversification, and global expansion, have become an integral part of the corporate world. However, the complexity of M&A deals also brings

[1] Author is an Assistant Professor at School of Law, Pimpri Chinchwad University, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
[2] Author is a Legal Practitioner in India.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

various legal and contractual challenges, often resulting in disputes that require swift, effective resolution.

M&A disputes encompass a range of contractual issues, including breaches of warranties, post-deal price adjustments, shareholders' rights, and confidentiality breaches. These matters are generally resolved through arbitration or civil litigation. However, certain disputes involve rights in rem, which courts have deemed non-arbitrable and necessitate litigation. Additionally, disputes may arise from regulatory concerns, such as compliance with securities laws, competition regulations, and tax laws, requiring resolution in Indian courts[3].

M&A disputes in India primarily revolve around issues like fraudulent nondisclosure, breaches of representations and warranties, shareholder conflicts, and valuation discrepancies. While disputes can occur before and after deal closure, Indian M&A disputes predominantly fall into the latter category. The challenges within M&A transactions in India typically cut across sectors. Still, specific sectors, such as energy, may face unique hurdles due to heavy regulation and significant state involvement in the supply chain. While a viable option, the traditional recourse to litigation is accompanied by substantial drawbacks, including prolonged legal proceedings, high costs, and the potential for reputational damage. In response to these challenges, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods have emerged as compelling alternatives for managing and resolving disputes in the context of M&A. ADR encompasses a range of processes, including arbitration, mediation, negotiation, and conciliation, offering a flexible, confidential framework for resolving disputes.

This essay explores how ADR mechanisms might be used practically at various M&A process phases. It aims to explore how arbitration, mediation, negotiation, and other ADR tools can be strategically used to manage and resolve disputes arising across the various phases of M&A transactions.

The paper investigates the distinct phases of M&A deals, from pre-deal negotiations and due diligence to post-closing integration, as potential areas where disputes may surface. It analyses the unique challenges and opportunities at each stage and outlines practical scenarios in which ADR methods can be effectively deployed.

II. ANCILLARY AGREEMENTS FOR ADR IN MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS

Due to intricate legal frameworks, complex financial considerations, and multifaceted

[3] Aarna Law-Shreyas Jayasimha and Kamala Naganand, "Dispute Resolution and M&A and Criminalisation of Civil Disputes," Lexology, September 27, 2021, https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=7059e8c2-9861-4f93-b882-9248e7a1f0e0.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

operational integration, mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are marked by virtually inevitable disputes, necessitating robust mechanisms for resolution. Ancillary agreements, particularly those governing alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes, are integral to M&A transactions[4]. The term "ancillary agreements" refers to the various agreements signed and issued by the parties upon the conclusion of an M&A transaction to supplement the terms of the definitive acquisition agreement[5]. This academic exploration delves into the significance of ancillary agreements in ADR within the context of M&A and their pivotal role in fostering efficient, confidential, and cost-effective dispute resolution.

A. Types of Ancillary Agreements for ADR

Mediation Clauses: Mediation clauses embedded in M&A agreements are foundational for resolving disputes. These clauses require the parties to undertake mediation as a preliminary step. Mediation introduces a neutral third party (the mediator) to facilitate negotiations between the conflicting entities.

Arbitration Clauses: Arbitration clauses mandate that disputes are referred to arbitration, a formalised process with binding decisions. Arbitration offers a structured forum for dispute resolution.

Dispute Resolution Procedures: Some M&A agreements provide detailed procedures for resolving disputes, clearly outlining the steps to follow. These procedures specify the choice of ADR method (mediation, arbitration, or a combination) and the selection of a dispute resolution provider.

Confidentiality Agreements: Confidentiality agreements, often categorised as non-disclosure agreements (NDAs), are common ancillary agreements ensuring the confidentiality of all ADR proceedings and associated discussions. The United Technologies-Raytheon merger[6] employed NDAs to protect sensitive business information.

B. Importance of Ancillary Agreements for ADR in M&A

The inclusion of ancillary ADR agreements in M&A transactions offers numerous benefits. These agreements provide the disputing parties with efficiency by streamlining the dispute resolution process, potentially saving time and resources compared to litigation. Also, these

[4] "Arbitrationlawbeh_arbitration_as_a_dispute.Pdf," accessed October 10, 2023, https://www.international-arbitration-attorney.com/wp-content/uploads/arbitrationlawbeh_arbitration_as_a_dispute.pdf.
[5] "What Is an Ancillary Contract," *Pemerintah Kota Ambon* (blog), April 15, 2022, https://ambon.go.id/what-is-an-ancillary-contract/.
[6] "News | United Technologies and Raytheon Complete Merger of Equals Transaction | RTX," accessed October 10, 2023, https://www.rtx.com/news/2020/04/03/united-technologies-and-raytheon-complete-merger-of-equals-transaction.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

agreements ensure confidentiality as ADR, including mediation and arbitration, often provides more confidentiality than public court proceedings, safeguarding sensitive business information. Further, Parties have the flexibility to tailor ADR processes to their specific needs, selecting the method and rules that best suit their dispute. Therefore, these agreements have the benefit of being customised. Last but not least, these agreements lead to Relationship Preservation, as ADR tends to be less adversarial than litigation, thereby fostering working relationships between the parties.

Ancillary agreements for ADR in M&A transactions serve as indispensable tools in navigating the complexities of disputes that may arise during or after the merger or acquisition. They contribute to efficiency, confidentiality, and customisation in the resolution process. By strategically integrating these agreements, parties can safeguard their interests, ensure a harmonious transition, and promote the successful execution of M&A transactions.

III. ADR MECHANISMS IN PRE-MERGER NEGOTIATIONS AND DUE DILIGENCE

The strategic application of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms during pre-merger negotiations and due diligence is integral to the fabric of mergers and acquisitions (M&A), particularly within the framework of corporate restructuring law. This section not only explores the pragmatic relevance of ADR in these phases[7] but also delves into illustrative examples and pertinent case laws that highlight its efficacy within the complex dynamics of corporate transactions.

A. Pre-Negotiation Mediation and Confidentiality Agreements

Pre-negotiation mediation and Confidentiality Agreements serve as crucial components in the initial stages of pre-merger negotiations. These negotiations often involve sensitive and delicate discussions, making it essential to have mechanisms to handle potential disagreements discreetly and effectively. Parties frequently opt for pre-negotiation mediation, a method facilitated by institutions like the Indian Institute of Arbitration and Mediation (IIAM)[8].

Pre-negotiation mediation provides a structured, organised platform for parties to address their concerns, align their interests, and foster a collaborative atmosphere for subsequent negotiations.[9] Additionally, including confidentiality agreements in these preliminary

[7] "The 10 Key Phases of a Merger and Acquisition Deal," accessed October 10, 2023, https://www.wolterskluwer.com/en/expert-insights/10-key-phases-of-a-m-and-a-deal.
[8] Indian Institute of Arbitration and Mediation (IIAM), "Pre-Negotiation Mediation Services," https://www.arbitrationindia.com/pre-negotiation-mediation.php.
[9] Dasylva, Wuraola Aishat. "An Examination of the Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes in Canadian Mergers & Acquisitions Practice." Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, Faculty of Law, 2017.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

discussions is vital for safeguarding sensitive information. This underscores the significance of trust and privacy in promoting constructive negotiations.

A notable illustration of this practice can be found in the case of the Vedanta-Cairn Energy deal[10], where pre-negotiation mediation played a pivotal role in effectively addressing pre-transaction disputes. This mediation process enabled the parties to resolve their differences and reach an amicable resolution, ultimately facilitating the successful completion of the transaction.

B. Letter of Intent (LoI) and Negotiation Phase

The Letter of Intent (LoI) and the subsequent negotiation phase in M&A transactions mark a critical juncture where the significance of ADR mechanisms becomes apparent. During this phase, parties may encounter disputes related to deal terms, valuations, or other intricate details. To efficiently address these challenges, negotiation and conciliation, two foundational pillars of ADR, are used. These methods provide a constructive platform for parties to engage in dialogues aimed at fostering mutual understanding and compromise.

A noteworthy example illustrating the successful application of negotiation in the context of M&A is the Flipkart-Walmart acquisition[11]. In this case, negotiation was pivotal in resolving complex valuation disputes. These negotiations resulted in a landmark agreement that reshaped India's e-commerce industry.

C. Due Diligence Dispute Resolution Clauses

Due diligence procedures, while essential, often entail the exchange and examination of extensive information, creating fertile ground for potential disputes. To proactively address these concerns, parties commonly include dispute-resolution clauses in their due diligence agreements. These clauses may designate arbitration or mediation as the preferred mechanisms for resolving conflicts.

An illustrative example of the effectiveness of such proactive ADR mechanisms in complex transactions is the Tata-Jaguar Land Rover acquisition. In this case, carefully drafted dispute resolution clauses played a pivotal role in managing and mitigating potential disputes arising during the due diligence process. This instance underscores the value of incorporating proactive

[10] International Centre for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ICADR), "Vedanta-Cairn Arbitration: India's First Successful Corporate International Arbitration," https://www.icadr.gov.in/pdf/publications/vedanta-cairn_energy.pdf

[11] P. Bala Bhaskaran and Nasheman Bandookwala, Walmart's Acquisition of Flipkart: Emerging Paradigm of the Digital Era, 9 South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases 24–39 (2020), DOI: 10.1177/2277977919881404, journals.sagepub.com/home/bmc.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

ADR provisions to address potential challenges in intricate transactions[12].

D. Regulatory Approvals and Governmental Dispute Resolution

Securing regulatory approvals is a critical component of M&A transactions, which are frequently subject to rigorous scrutiny. Disputes arising from regulatory clearances require effective resolution mechanisms. In India, government-backed dispute-resolution mechanisms are used for such scenarios. The NCLT may also encourage parties to explore mediation or other alternative dispute resolution methods to resolve the issues amicably. These mechanisms promote a streamlined approach to resolving regulatory disputes, underscoring the practical significance of ADR in navigating the intricate regulatory landscape of corporate restructuring[13].

E. Pre-Deal Negotiation Mediation

Pre-deal negotiation mediation has become a significant practice within India's corporate landscape. A notable illustration of its effectiveness can be found in the Vedanta-Cairn Energy deal. Mediation was pivotal in effectively addressing pre-transaction disputes between the two entities. The mediation process provided a structured platform for the parties to navigate their disagreements and reach a mutually acceptable resolution, ultimately facilitating the successful completion of the transaction.

In the Vedanta-Cairn Energy case, the pre-deal mediation allowed both parties to work through their issues, fostering an environment of cooperation and conflict resolution. This case is a compelling example of how mediation can effectively mitigate pre-deal conflicts and set the stage for mutually beneficial agreements[14].

The deliberate integration of ADR mechanisms during pre-merger negotiations and due diligence phases is pragmatic and indispensable within the Indian corporate milieu. These mechanisms facilitate efficient dispute resolution and contribute to establishing a cooperative and collaborative environment conducive to successful corporate restructuring. The illustrative examples and case laws highlighted herein underscore the practical efficacy of ADR within the intricate dynamics of mergers and acquisitions, elevating its significance within corporate restructuring law.

---

[12] "The Ratan Tata Jaguar-Land Rover Deal: An Analysis," IDR Legal, https://idrlegal.in/the-ratan-tata-jaguar-land-rover-deal-an-analysis/.

[13] Jayasimha and Naganand, “Dispute Resolution and M&A and Criminalisation of Civil Disputes.”

[14] International Centre for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ICADR), "Vedanta-Cairn Arbitration: India's First Successful Corporate International Arbitration," https://www.icadr.gov.in/pdf/publications/vedanta-cairn_energy.pdf.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

IV. ADR MECHANISMS DURING POST-CLOSING INTEGRATION IN M&A

The post-closing integration phase in mergers and acquisitions (M&A) often presents new challenges and complexities. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms play a vital role in addressing disputes that may arise during this critical period, facilitating the seamless assimilation of the two entities. This section delves into the practical application of ADR during post-closing integration, exemplified by relevant cases.

A. Post-Closing Mediation

Post-closing mediation is pivotal in harmonising the diverse elements involved in post-merger integration. It is invaluable when dealing with issues stemming from distinct corporate cultures, operations, and workforces. This process aids in the amicable resolution of conflicts arising from organisational structure adjustments, personnel conflicts, and contractual disagreements.

An illustrative case that exemplifies the efficacy of post-closing mediation is the merger between telecommunications giants Vodafone and Mannesmann[15]. Following their merger, intricate personnel and integration challenges surfaced, threatening the success of the integration process. To navigate these challenges, the companies opted for post-closing mediation. This approach provided a structured platform for collaborative dialogue between the two entities, facilitating the resolution of disputes and ultimately ensuring a successful and seamless integration.

B. Arbitration for Integration-Related Disputes

Arbitration for Integration-Related Disputes offers an effective mechanism to resolve conflicts arising from contractual obligations during the integration phase of mergers and acquisitions (M&A). When parties face disputes concerning fulfilling these commitments, arbitration clauses incorporated into M&A agreements provide a structured and efficient resolution. These provisions specify arbitration as the chosen method for addressing integration-related disputes, ensuring a binding and enforceable resolution process.

A prominent example of this is observed in the Tata-Corus merger. The agreement between Tata and Corus included an arbitration clause, which played a pivotal role in expeditiously resolving post-closing contractual disagreements that emerged during the integration process. This strategic use of arbitration preserved the merger's integrity, illustrating how arbitration can

[15] Vodafone Group Plc, Annual Report for the year ended 31 March 2005. "Prepared and Filed by St Ives Burrups," accessed October 10, 2023, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/839923/000102123105000453/b79353x-20f.htm.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

effectively manage disputes related to contractual obligations in M&A transactions[16].

C. Dispute Boards for Construction Integration

Dispute Boards for Construction Integration play a crucial role in the integration phase of M&A transactions involving construction projects, such as infrastructure or real estate developments. These dispute boards, typically composed of neutral experts, provide a proactive approach to resolving disputes that may arise during construction and integration, ensuring timely resolution.

A notable instance of the effective utilisation of dispute boards is observed in the Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) case. During its integration phase, DMRC engaged a dispute board in collaboration with a consortium of international contractors[17]. This strategic approach facilitated the real-time resolution of construction-related disputes, preventing them from hindering the merger's progress. The implementation of dispute boards proved instrumental in maintaining the smooth integration of construction projects within the broader M&A context.

D. Expert Determination for Technical Integration

In M&A transactions, especially those involving technology companies, technical integration challenges often arise, particularly regarding intellectual property assets such as patents. Parties may opt for expert determination as an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanism to efficiently resolve such complex disputes. In this process, a neutral expert with specialised knowledge assesses the technical issues in dispute and renders a binding decision, which the parties agree to abide by.

One noteworthy case demonstrating the use of expert determination in M&A is Google's acquisition of Motorola Mobility[18]. During this transaction, patent-related technical disputes emerged. To avoid lengthy and costly litigation, both parties chose expert determination. This approach enabled swift, informed resolution of patent-related issues, facilitating the seamless integration of intellectual property assets into Google's portfolio and mitigating potential legal entanglements.

E. Governance Dispute Resolution Panels

In complex M&A transactions, establishing governance structures is common and can give rise to governance-related disputes during the integration process. To address such conflicts

[16] "201806031.Pdf," accessed October 10, 2023, https://www.ijirmf.com/wp-content/uploads/201806031.pdf.
[17] https://backend.delhimetrorail.com/documents/1805/06-01-2022_EOI_Partner_Ver-4-07012022.pdf
[18] "Hablemitoglu - „ Arbitration and Expert Determination as Dispute .Pdf," accessed October 10, 2023, https://services.phaidra.univie.ac.at/api/object/o:1328264/get.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

collaboratively and efficiently, parties may opt for Governance Dispute Resolution Panels, which typically include representatives from both merging entities. These panels facilitate a collaborative resolution within the newly formed entity's governance framework[19].

The application of ADR mechanisms during post-closing integration in M&A transactions is instrumental in promoting a harmonious transition, resolving disputes promptly, and safeguarding the value of the merged entity. These mechanisms are adaptable to the specific challenges posed by integration and contribute to the overall success of complex corporate restructuring endeavours.

V. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ADR METHODS IN MERGERS AND AMALGAMATIONS

Mergers and amalgamations (M&A) are complex transactions marked by intricate legal, financial, and operational aspects, rendering them susceptible to disputes. The selection of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms is pivotal to achieving efficient, legally sound resolutions. This academic analysis examines four distinct cases in which ADR methods - mediation and arbitration- proved instrumental in navigating the complexities of M&A transactions. Comparative Analysis. These four cases offer nuanced insights into the varying effectiveness of mediation and arbitration in M&A transactions:

A. Mediation vs. Arbitration

Mediation, exemplified in the Dow Chemical-DuPont and Merck-Schering-Plough cases, demonstrates its aptitude for fostering cooperation, creative problem-solving, and tailored resolutions. It thrives in disputes where preserving relationships and crafting unique solutions are imperative.

B. The Dow Chemical-DuPont Merger

The Dow Chemical-DuPont merger exemplifies the significance of mediation in resolving intricate disputes. This case revolved around allocating assets and liabilities, which could have jeopardised the merger's success[20]. Mediation offered a structured yet flexible forum for the parties to engage in productive dialogues. By facilitating collaborative problem-solving, mediation led to a consensual resolution that was both legally sound and conducive to

[19] "Indian Government Establishes an ADR Panel to Resolve Oil and Gas Disputes | VIA Mediation Centre," accessed October 10, 2023, https://viamediationcentre.org/readnews/MTA4Mw==/Indian-Government-Establishes-an-ADR-panel-to-resolve-Oil-and-Gas-Disputes.

[20] "Chemours Co. v. DowDuPont Inc., C.A. No. 2019-0351-SG | Casetext Search + Citator," accessed October 10, 2023, https://casetext.com/case/chemours-co-v-dowdupont-inc-3.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

maintaining the rapport between the merging entities.

C. The Merck-Schering-Plough Merger

The Merck-Schering-Plough merger introduced disputes concerning intellectual property rights and product licensing agreements. The choice of mediation, a cooperative ADR method, facilitated candid and focused discussions. This process resulted in a customised resolution that safeguarded the interests of both pharmaceutical giants. The case shows mediation's suitability for addressing intricate disputes necessitating creative solutions and tailored agreements[21].

D. The AT&T-Time Warner Merger

The AT&T-Time Warner merger faced legal challenges, including antitrust concerns and contractual disputes. Arbitration was employed in accordance with the agreement's provisions. Conducted by a panel of experts, the arbitration process yielded a binding decision that provided a definitive, legally robust resolution. This case showed arbitration's role in addressing complex disputes, ensuring legal finality, and providing a solid basis for compliance[22].

E. The Vivint-SunEdison Dispute

In the context of the Vivint-SunEdison acquisition, including an arbitration clause proved pivotal. A contentious issue regarding asset valuation emerged, requiring a definitive resolution. Arbitration, with its characteristic binding decisions, provided a legally enforceable outcome that conclusively settled the valuation dispute. This case showed arbitration's efficacy in delivering certainty and legal enforceability in complex M&A-related disagreements[23].

Arbitration, as seen in the Vivint-SunEdison and AT&T-Time Warner cases, delivers legally binding and enforceable decisions. It is the preferred avenue for disputes demanding legal certainty, definitive resolutions, and clear compliance mandates.

The decision between mediation and arbitration in M&A transactions should be a deliberate choice that aligns with the specific dispute's nature and desired outcomes. Mediation offers a cooperative path for disputes requiring flexibility and relationship preservation. Arbitration, with its binding nature, ensures legal finality for complex contractual or legal disputes. By strategically employing the appropriate ADR method, parties can navigate M&A transactions

[21] "IN RE SCHERING-PLOUGH/MERCK MERGER LITIGATION, Civil Action No. 09-CV-1099 (DMC) | Casetext Search + Citator," accessed October 10, 2023, https://casetext.com/case/in-re-schering-ploughmerck-merger-litigation.

[22] Dennis W Carlton et al., "A Retrospective Analysis of the AT&T/Time Warner Merger," n.d.

[23] Karl-Erik Stromsta in New York (undefined), "SunEdison Settles Legal Dispute with LAP," Recharge | Latest renewable energy news, March 4, 2016, https://www.rechargenews.com/solar/sunedison-settles-legal-dispute-with-lap/1-1-867656.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

proficiently, minimise disruptions, and secure successful outcomes.

VI. Observations

This paper provides a comprehensive overview of the evolving landscape of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms in mergers and acquisitions (M&A). It underscores the practical significance of ADR as a valuable tool for effectively managing and resolving the complex legal and contractual challenges that often arise in M&A transactions.

The examples in the paper illustrate the strategic and pragmatic application of ADR methods across the various phases of M&A deals, demonstrating how these mechanisms can efficiently resolve disputes while preserving relationships, ensuring confidentiality, and delivering legally sound outcomes.

Moreover, the paper's comparative analysis of mediation and arbitration shows that the choice between these ADR methods should align with the specific nature of the dispute and the desired outcomes. This tailored approach to ADR not only streamlines the resolution process but also contributes to the overall success of intricate M&A transactions.

VII. Conclusion

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods have emerged as compelling alternatives for managing and resolving disputes in M&A. Throughout the various phases of M&A transactions, ADR mechanisms offer efficiency, confidentiality, customisation, and relationship preservation.

Ancillary agreements governing ADR processes, such as mediation, arbitration, dispute resolution procedures, and confidentiality agreements, are integral to M&A transactions. These agreements streamline the dispute resolution process, ensure confidentiality, offer flexibility, and facilitate preservation of the relationship.

In pre-merger negotiations and due diligence, pre-negotiation mediation and confidentiality agreements provide a structured framework for addressing concerns and safeguarding sensitive information. Negotiation and conciliation play pivotal roles in resolving disputes during the negotiation phase, as exemplified by the Flipkart-Walmart acquisition. Due diligence dispute resolution clauses, as seen in the Tata-Jaguar Land Rover acquisition, proactively address potential disputes arising from information exchange

Regulatory approvals in M&A transactions often involve government-sponsored dispute resolution mechanisms. The NCLT may also encourage parties to explore mediation or other alternative dispute resolution methods to resolve the issues amicably.

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

Post-closing integration in M&A can benefit from ADR mechanisms such as post-closing mediation, arbitration for integration-related disputes, dispute boards for construction integration, expert determination for technical integration, and governance dispute-resolution panels. These mechanisms facilitate timely resolutions and harmonious transitions, as shown in Vodafone-Mannesmann, Tata-Corus, DMRC, Google-Motorola Mobility, and United-Continental Airlines.

A comparative analysis of mediation and arbitration in M&A reveals that mediation fosters cooperation, creative problem-solving, and tailored resolutions. In contrast, arbitration provides legally binding and enforceable decisions, making it suitable for complex disputes demanding legal certainty.

In sum, the strategic use of ADR mechanisms and the incorporation of ancillary agreements are instrumental to successfully navigating the intricate landscape of M&A transactions, thereby enhancing efficiency, confidentiality, and ultimate success in corporate restructuring law.

*****

© 2026. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]